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Abstract: The Bosnian Genocide was a horrific ethnic and religious conflict that took place towards the end of the twentieth century. In the Genocide, Serbian nationalist fighters systematically killed over 80,000 Bosnian Muslims over a four-year period. The unique political and religious context of the conflict—in which Islam, Orthodox Christianity, and Catholicism were all important communal identifiers—should prompt a nuanced discussion of how religion functions in the midst of conflict. Utilizing Eboo Patel’s concept of the “faith line” and religious pluralism as a point of origin, this article argues for increased attention to theological peacebuilding work in the wake of the Bosnian Genocide. To do so, this article will begin with a review of the historical roots of the conflict which will demonstrate the intimate role that religion played in the conflict, as well as the different religious justifications offered by the Bosnian government. This article will then engage in a comparative analysis of both Christian and Muslim reconciliation traditions, demonstrating that peacebuilding is not simply a political goal, but is also directly related to the respective faith traditions of Islam and Christianity. Finally, several reconciliation projects, both secular and religious, are highlighted in order to show how religious pluralism still plays an active role in breaking down communal boundaries and promoting peace.

Introduction

The unique context of the Bosnian genocide and subsequent civil war, during which Serbian nationalist fighters carried out the systematic murder of over 80,000 Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks) and Catholic Croatians during a four-year period, granted both religious traditions an under-recognized opportunity to explore interreligious methods for sustainable peace. While the genocide was born out of a myriad of political and ethnocultural factors, religion played a key role in the justification and perpetration of the atrocities. For example, the Serbian Orthodox Church frequently authorized and blessed the massacre of Muslims, citing the potential threat they presented to Serbian dominance.²
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Appeals to religious traditions presents a unique opportunity for peacekeeping in this scenario because of the significance of religion in Bosnia-Herzegovina today. Indeed, the World Atlas has recorded than 51% of residents identify with Islam, 31% with Orthodox Christianity, and 15% with Roman Catholicism.\(^3\) Considering the fact that 97% of the country belongs to one of the three religions actively involved in the genocide, it is unsurprising that religious tensions are still present in Bosnia today. Despite previous difficulties in reconciling religious differences, interreligious dialogue—defined by Jennifer Llewellyn and Daniel Philpott as “activities that aim to build sustainable, just, and peaceful relationships in the wake of war and other systemic human rights violations”—show great promise in helping achieve long-term peacebuilding.\(^4\)

The notion of interreligious dialogue being used as a viable means for political peacebuilding is not new. Going back as far as the fifth century, Augustine of Hippo wrote in \textit{The City of God} that, for human beings, the ultimate objective of war is peace.\(^5\) In this way, important to any conception of religious peacebuilding is interreligious dialogue. In his memoir \textit{Acts of Faith} Eboo Patel wrote and reflected extensively on the idea of the “faith line.” Drawing from W.E.B. Du Bois’s idea of the “color line,” Patel wrote:

> On one side of the faith line are the religious totalitarians. Their conviction is that only one interpretation of religion is a legitimate way of being, believing, and belonging on earth. Everyone else needs to be cowed, or converted, or condemned, or killed. On the other side of the faith line are the religious pluralists, who hold that people believing in different creeds and belonging to different communities need to learn to live together.\(^6\)

Understanding that Christian Orthodox Serbs were the primary aggressors while the Muslim Bosniaks were the largest victimized group, Patel’s idea of the “faith line” will provide the basis for a later comparison of Christian and Islamic traditions of reconciliation and post-conflict justice. Beginning with a historical analysis of the ethnically fueled causes of religion’s role in sanctioning violence, this essay will conclude with post-war efforts at religious pluralism and reconciliation that continue to be implemented today. The primary
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aim is to, through a comparison of the Islamic and Christian traditions, analyze the history of the conflict as well as emphasize the importance of religion and theological work as an agent in post-conflict peace.

**Religious Roots of the Conflict**

At the end of the Second World War, communist freedom fighter Josip Broz Tito reestablished the Yugoslav Federation, which had previously existed until it was dismantled by Nazi Germany in 1941. Culturally and economically destroyed by the German Reich, the constituent countries of Macedonia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slovenia were united by the concept of “Brotherhood and Unity.” Despite religious differences, the countries comprising the federation recognized their cultural and linguistic similarities and were originally committed to the idea of an ethnically and religiously pluralistic Yugoslavia. Among all the countries and ethnic groups, it was the Bosnian Muslims in particular who were especially committed to this idea of religious tolerance. As Michael Anthony Sells writes, “many people in Bosnia-Herzegovina sought a nation based not on exclusive affiliation but on constitutional rule and respect for differing religions.”

The Bosnian tendency towards religious tolerance is not surprising considering their historical context. As the original and most numerous indigenous community of Muslims in an otherwise Christian-dominated Europe, Bosniaks had spent years under the control of Christian empires. Nevertheless, they had always managed to maintain religious sovereignty through interreligious dialogue, particularly during their subjugation by the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Despite not always having governmental autonomy, the Bosniak community always considered itself to be Muslim first and was able to reconcile any ensuing political differences through frequent dialogue and tolerance of others.

This overtly tolerant stance towards other religions was significantly influenced by the religious and cultural influences of the Ottoman Empire and the Hanafi madhhab. Husein Kavazović, Grand Mufti of Bosnia-Herzegovina since 2012, has been careful to
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stress the importance of the Ottoman-inspired madhhab, often considered to be one of the most flexible schools of thought in Islam, on Bosnian Islamic social thought. He has claimed that Bosnian Muslims have always cherished an open, bright, and tolerant Islamic view of the world on account of the influence of the spiritual path of love (tasawwuf) that originated in the Ottoman Empire.”

As a result of this historical precedent, by the time the Yugoslav Federation was reformed, the Muslim community in Bosnia-Herzegovina had a long history of living among and interacting with people of different religious and ethnic backgrounds, always managing to maintain their cultural and religious identity in a respectful way.

During the period of Yugoslav unification prior to the 1991 Slovenian and Croatian declaration of independence, the religious narrative in the Christian-majority countries was vastly different than the one experienced in Muslim Bosnia-Herzegovina. While maintaining an official position of religious cooperation and tolerance, religious nationalists in Orthodox Serbia, as well as Catholic Croatia, constituted a small yet vocal percentage of the population. Those religious nationalists wanted their countries, and consequently their religions, to exert greater control and influence over the Yugoslav Federation.

While consistently promoting racist attitudes and policies, the true extent of religious nationalism remained unseen until 1987, when the death of Josip Broz Tito allowed for more nationalistic leaders to take control of the Federation.

Using a conflict with Albania over the Serbian-majority region of Kosovo to incite nationalist pride, Serbian president Slobodan Milošević dominated the Federation until the 1991 secession of Slovenia and Croatia. Milošević’s forces then invaded Croatia in an attempt to eliminate the Catholic resistance and achieve a “Greater Serbia,” wherein those who were ethnically Serbian and religiously Orthodox Christian would be intrinsically superior to those who are not. In the face of Bosnians using their religious beliefs as a basis for tolerance and for political cooperation, the Serbs used it as the rationale for the systemic murder of thousands of people. Within the context of the collapsing Yugoslavia,
Eboo Patel would associate religious pluralism with the Bosniaks, whereas the Serbians, who committed genocide on the belief that Orthodox Christianity was the one true religion, would be classified as religious totalitarians.

**Religious Justification of the Conflict**

Following the Croatian cessation of territory to Serbian forces, nationalist fighters were able to invade Bosnia-Herzegovina to attack Muslim populations. The fervor and cruelty with which they systematically murdered men, women, and children was greatly increased due to a propaganda campaign from the government. Speeches and radio announcements attempting to ethnically “other” the Bosnian population meant that the Serbian forces had no desire to simply annex or control the Muslim populations, but instead wipe them off the face of the Earth. In a potent example of Serbian cruelty, General Radovan Karadžić, in a speech to Bosnian leaders, ominously said, “Do not think that you will not lead Bosnia-Herzegovina into hell, and do not think that you will not perhaps make the Muslim people disappear, because Muslims cannot defend themselves if there is war.”

While the persecution of Bosnians was initiated by the government and the first executions were carried out by the army, religious beliefs quickly made it so the entirety of Serbia was involved in the genocide. One of the key elements to understanding the conflict is the role of the Orthodox clergy in organizing as well as blessing the systematic killing. Through the use of heavy religious imagery, the Bosnian Muslims were shown to be a threat “physically, politically, and spiritually,” to any conception of a homogenous Serbian nation. The 44th Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church, known colloquially as Patriarch Pavle, gave strong support to the cause of the Serbian forces, preaching, “Evil always attacks, and good must defend itself… Cain always tries to kill Abel, and Abel has to defend himself. Defending oneself against attacks by wrongdoers, defending one’s life, life and the peace of one’s nearest and dearest against the criminals. These are the limits that define a just war.” This incendiary sermon not only neglects the fact that Serbians were the aggressors but, while citing the Bible, the highest religious authority in Serbia condoned
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torture and violence, encouraging anyone who considered themselves to be a true believer to participate in the Muslim extermination. This fusion of religious fervor and political authority led to demonic acts that not only killed Bosnians but served to discourage any potential resistance efforts. Blatant mortification of religious imagery, such as Muslim children being crucified in front of their parents, would have completely humiliated the proud Muslim tradition of the Bosnian community.  

Particularly egregious was the destruction of the Bosnian town of Zvornik. Widely known for its heritage of Muslim poets, saints, rebels, and mystics, it was completely decimated by Serbian forces after they murdered or expelled the entire population of the town. Michael Sells writes, “a representation of five hundred years of shared living between Christians and Muslims [was destroyed when] the mayor dedicated a new church, renamed a local, formerly Muslim village ‘Saint Stephen,’ and kissed a crucifix.” These acts didn’t just kill the physical bodies of the Bosnian Muslims, they eradicated any sense of communal pride or tradition that could have given the poorly equipped Bosnian defenses something to rally around. Everything was brutally remade in the homogenous image of Orthodox Serbian Christianity.  

What began as an attempt to eliminate any ethnic resistance to a homogenous Serbian state was quickly elevated, through religious propaganda, to a devastating genocide. Serbian Christians were told by their government as well as their religious authorities that Islamic believers represented a threat to themselves, their families, and the entire Serbian way of life. Such blatant “othering” of an entire religion marks the very extremes of religious totalitarianism. Serbian Christians could not reconcile with the fact that there were believers of another religion living among them, particularly a religion such as Islam, which they perceived to be heretical and bordering on cultic. While the Serbian Orthodox Church eventually came to play a role in negotiating a ceasefire, the devastating impacts that its immoral actions and its blatant “othering” had on the Muslim community cannot be forgotten.
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Religious Reconciliation and Peacebuilding

Since religion was the catalyst that allowed an ethnically rooted political struggle to transform into the systemic massacre of tens of thousands of innocent Muslims, it is potentially difficult to conceptualize what possible role religion could play in post-war reconciliation. However, the primary religious issue during the Bosnian genocide was the way that the Orthodox Serbian nationalists warped religious doctrine and scriptural sources to demonize the Islamic faith. The brutal acts of crucifying children and making enslaved men sing Christian psalms were a demented attempt to correct the Muslim beliefs, which the right-wing Serbians, as religious totalitarians, saw as heretical.26

The issue, therefore, is not the fact of religious difference, but rather deeply ingrained religious misconceptions. A recent report on youth interreligious dialogue produces sobering statistics on the recent state of dialogue, with only 2% of Christian students in Central Bosnian schools able to explain the significance of the two main Muslim Eids (Islamic holidays), and only 32% of Muslim students knowing why Easter and Christmas are celebrated.27 Religion itself is not the issue—the issue is devastating misconceptions in conversation with a historical precedent of hatred. In a poll questioning 2060 people from 13 cities across Bosnia, 59% responded that religious figures and traditional religion would be either “very important” or “important” to the reconciliation process.28 Despite international doubt, there is a very clear place for religious peacebuilding in this post-conflict region of the world.

Despite the ever-increasing interconnectedness of the modern world, it wasn’t until recently that the conception of Islamic reconciliation has been discussed authoritatively. Sayyid Jamâl Al-Dîn Al-Afghānî argues that the reasoning behind this fact stems from the didactic way that the Islamic faith, as well as Sharia law, guides the lives of Muslims.29 In an argument that runs contradictory to any sense of nationalism, he claims that the bonds to one’s place of birth are completely made up “… [which] explains the aversion which
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Muslims have for manifestations of ethnic origin in every country where they live.” He goes on to argue that Muslims hold no clan loyalty and are solely connected through shared religious beliefs and the ensuing solidarity that comes from it. This argument, while perhaps foreign to those outside of the Islamic faith, lends an explanation to the lack of Islamic reconciliation scholarship. If the Muslim community feels no political connection to any particular nation-state, they would feel no need to reconcile with anyone who does not share their faith. In the context of Bosnia-Herzegovina, this is a possible explanation for why there were not strong nationalistic tendencies among the Bosnian Muslims. The pain that they felt during the genocide came from the death of their fellow Muslims and the destruction of their mosques, not from the destruction of their country or any of its administrative edifices. They had always cooperated politically but maintained their cultural identity through their Islamic faith. Therefore, their loyalties were to Allah and the Islamic faith, not constructed political ideologies.

Nevertheless, in response to the growing globalization of the world community, a theology of reconciliation has begun to develop within the Islamic tradition. Any notion of reconciliation has to be primarily concerned with forgiveness. Any attempt at reconciling a right relationship between the faiths will require mutual acceptance as members of a shared community, a restoration of communication, and a mutual recognition of each other’s humanity. This notion of social reconciliation, expressed by Lina Strupinskienè, is important to the Quranic interpretation of forgiveness as written in Al-Hujurat: “The Believers are but a single Brotherhood, so make peace and reconciliation between your two (contending) brothers.” The key phrase in this Surah is the believers. At the time the Qur’an was written, the believers would have referred to both Christians and Jews, as fellow Abrahamic believers were followers of the law. Therefore, for the affected Bosnian Muslims as well as Islamic believers around the world, reconciliation is no longer a political matter, but something that is directly commanded by Allah. To forgive and reconcile with
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Christians can be perceived as a sort of commandment, and therefore something that, even if an Islamic community chooses to reject political affiliations, would be obligated to fulfill.

Just as in the Islamic tradition, forgiveness is critical to the Christian tradition. Indeed, Daniel Philpott writes, “In the New Testament, righteousness, justice, and mercy converge to describe the process by which God reconciles his people to himself and then calls his people to reconcile with one another.” Just as the Islamic tradition teaches, those who are righteous and reconcile themselves with others are obeying and emulating God, and are therefore living holy lives. This would be incredibly important to any true Christian, but particularly important to the Orthodox Serbians. As the perpetrators of horrible war crimes, they were subject to an incredible amount of international scrutiny as well as unprecedented legal action. Despite these harsh realities, their Christian faith, the same faith used to justify the genocide, offers the opportunity for reconciliation and forgiveness. By admitting their fault in an effort to restore right relationships, they are offering themselves up to their Muslim counterparts. This sacrificial mentality, emulating the sacrifice of Jesus, is essential to the ultimate longevity of peace and true reconciliation.

Reconciliation in Practice

While theoretical conceptions of reconciliation and practical attempts at peacebuilding have been proposed since the signing of the ceasefire, there are still disconnects in the theory of reconciliation and its realization in post-war Bosnia-Herzegovina. The previously mentioned lack of religious dialogue is extremely problematic due to the ignorance that it facilitates (if not encourages). If the two groups do not have a fundamental understanding of each other, it is exponentially harder to make positive progress. Nevertheless, there have been several promising areas of reconciliation following the genocide, most notably among the youth and female populations.

The current social situation among youth populations in Bosnia is extremely segregated. Muslim and Christian followers rarely interact with each other, with schools and neighborhoods among some of the most segregated institutions. Without frequent
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interaction, it is very easy for religious and ethnic misconceptions to occur, and remain uncorrected.\(^{38}\) However, youth activist movements such as Svi Zajedno (All Together), recognize this disparity and work tirelessly to help promote awareness and activism. The program gathers youth of all four major faiths in Bosnia (Islam, Orthodoxy, Catholicism, and Judaism) to participate in learning activities together, with activities ranging from organizing training seminars to volunteering in segregated schools.\(^{39}\) By working together in segregated communities, they are not only able to heighten their own awareness but promote religious dialogue to their peers and adults in the communities they visit. This program, along with others all across Bosnia, are helping take move the region towards religious pluralism by eliminating the ignorance that can so quickly lead to totalitarianism.

Additionally, women’s groups have had success at promoting religious pluralism since the beginning of the genocide. During times of conflict, Bosnian women often provided shelter for other women and children, and supported the neglected groups of Muslim refugees.\(^{40}\) These shelters served as positive steps in peacebuilding efforts which have continued to grow and support victims in the post-war era. For example, Medica Zenica started as a secular women’s NGO to support rape victims during the war.\(^{41}\) It has since grown under its founder, Amra Pandžo, to be a secular space for religious learning and reconciliation to help avoid the religious intolerance that allowed the war to begin and increase in intensity. Similar to the youth groups, women, originally a subset of the population deeply affected by the conflict, are now proving to be indispensable to the post-war reconciliation process.

**Conclusion**

The genocide that occurred in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 1990s was the perfect storm of ethnocultural, political, and religious tensions. Struggling to recoup losses after the Second World War and avoid Soviet influence, the former Yugoslavia, when it eventually fell, led to a multi-year war that cost hundreds of thousands of lives. Central to the conflict
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was the issue of religious intolerance, as the state and clerical sponsorship of Serbian Orthodox Christianity led to the persecution and systemic murder of Bosnian Muslims. The conflict is a brutal reminder of the disastrous impacts of religious totalitarianism. Because of the central role that religion played in igniting the conflict, moving towards the religiously plural side of Eboo Patel’s “faith line,” wherein victims and offenders come to understand the other’s religion and ethnicity, is essential to reconciliation within religious communities and between individuals. While there is still a substantial of progress to be made in achieving religious plurality, Bosnian activist groups among youth and women have garnered impressive grassroots support and are showing how effective interreligious understanding can be. Through reconciliation as taught by both the Islamic and Christian traditions, communities can hopefully be brought to a point of mutual understanding and a long-lasting peace can prevail.


